



**University of  
Zurich**<sup>UZH</sup>

**Zurich Open Repository and  
Archive**

University of Zurich  
University Library  
Strickhofstrasse 39  
CH-8057 Zurich  
[www.zora.uzh.ch](http://www.zora.uzh.ch)

---

Year: 2015

---

## **Risk factor assessment tools for the prevention of periodontitis progression a systematic review**

Lang, Niklaus P ; Suvan, Jean E ; Tonetti, Maurizio S

**Abstract:** OBJECTIVES (i) To identify characteristics of currently published patient-based tools used to assess levels of risk for periodontitis progression and (ii) systematically review the evidence documenting the use of patient-based risk assessment tools for predicting periodontitis progression. MATERIAL AND METHODS A systematic review was prepared on the basis of an electronic search of the literature supplemented with manually searching the relevant journals of the latest 5 years. Prospective and retrospective cohort studies were included as no randomized controlled clinical trials were available. RESULTS The search identified 336 titles, and 19 articles were included in this systematic review. The search identified five different risk assessment tools. Results of nine of 10 cohort studies reporting outcomes of 2110 patients indicate that risk assessment tools are able to identify subjects with different probability of periodontitis progression and/or tooth loss. Subjects with higher risk scores showed more progression of periodontitis and tooth loss. CONCLUSIONS In treated populations, results of patient-based risk assessments, for example periodontal risk calculator (PRC) and periodontal risk assessment (PRA), predicted periodontitis progression and tooth loss in various populations. Additional research on the utility of risk assessment and results in improving patient management are needed.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.12350>

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-120230>

Journal Article

Accepted Version

Originally published at:

Lang, Niklaus P; Suvan, Jean E; Tonetti, Maurizio S (2015). Risk factor assessment tools for the prevention of periodontitis progression a systematic review. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 42 Suppl(S16):S59-S70.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpe.12350>

# **Risk Factor Assessment Tools for the Prevention of Periodontitis Progression A Systematic Review**

Niklaus P. Lang, Jean E. Suvan & Maurizio S. Tonetti

Universities of Berne and Zurich, Switzerland, University College London Eastman Dental Institute, UK & European Research Group on Periodontology (ERGOPerio), Genova, Italy.

**Running Head:** Risk assessment tools in Periodontology

**Key words:** Risk factor assessment, validity, periodontal disease progression, attachment levels, tooth loss

**Corresponding author:**

Prof. Dr. Niklaus P. Lang

Scheuermattweg 33

CH-3043 Uettligen, Switzerland

Phone: +41 79 301 5505

nplang@switzerland.net

**Abstract**

*Objectives:* i) to identify characteristics of currently published patient-based tools used to assess levels of risk for periodontitis progression; and ii) systematically review the evidence documenting the use of patient-based risk assessment tools for predicting periodontitis progression.

*Material and methods:* A systematic review was prepared on the basis of an electronic search of the literature supplemented with manually searching the relevant

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: 10.1111/jcpe.12350

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

journals of the latest 5 years. Prospective and retrospective cohort studies were included as no randomized controlled clinical trials were available.

*Results:* The search identified 336 titles and 19 articles were included in this systematic review. The search identified 5 different risk assessment tools. Results of 9 of 10 cohort studies reporting outcomes of 2110 patients indicate that risk assessment tools are able to identify subjects with different probability of periodontitis progression and/or tooth loss. Subjects with higher risk scores showed more progression of periodontitis and tooth loss.

*Conclusions:* In treated populations, results of patient based risk assessments e.g. Periodontal Risk Calculator (PRC) and Periodontal Risk Assessment (PRA) predicted periodontitis progression and tooth loss in various populations. Additional research on the utility of risk assessment results in improving patient management are needed.

### **Clinical Relevance**

*Scientific rationale:* It would be clinically beneficial to stratify subjects into risk categories using tools accounting for the multifactorial nature of the disease as this may help in improving case prognosis and management after completion of active periodontal therapy.

*Principal Findings:* Results from this systematic review indicate that risk assessment tools such as the Periodontal Risk Calculator or the Periodontal Risk Assessment are predictors of periodontitis progression and tooth loss in treated populations.

*Clinical Implications:* Even in the absence of direct evidence of the clinical utility of risk assessment in patient management, clinicians may consider application of these principles to clinical practice.

### ***Conflict of interest and source of funding statement***

The authors declare no conflict of interest. This systematic review has been supported by the Clinical Research Foundation (CRF) for the Promotion of Oral

Health, Brienz, Switzerland and by the European Research Group on Periodontology (ERGOPerio), Genova, Italy. Although two of the authors (NPL, MST) had over the years developed a Periodontal Risk Assessment (PRA) for the progression of periodontitis after active therapy (Lang & Tonetti 2003), the authors declare no conflict of interest. The PRA is available for anybody at no cost ([www.perio-tools.com/PRA](http://www.perio-tools.com/PRA)). No financial compensation was ever provided to the authors. The owner of the website is the Clinical Research Foundation (CRF) for the Promotion of Oral Health, Brienz, Switzerland.

### ***Introduction***

The host response to etiologic agents and routine periodontal treatment outcomes vary among periodontitis patients; it is therefore clinically important to determine the relative risk for disease progression in a once treated patient. For the last several decades, efforts have been made to evaluate the utility of various predictors for periodontal disease progression. Unaided risk assessment and prognostication, however, have shown significant variability because chronic periodontitis is a multifactorial disease.

In that respect, single parameters have been assessed for their positive or negative predictive values to indicate periodontal disease progression or stability. Initially, these efforts were hampered by the lack of consensus on a clear definition of disease progression. Generally, the loss of periodontal attachment of  $\geq 2\text{mm}$  was used as an indication of progressive disease (Claffey et al. 1990; Lang et al. 1986; Tonetti & Claffey 2005). Occasionally,  $\geq 3\text{mm}$  was chosen as a threshold (Socransky et al. 1984). It is evident that with such thresholds minimal true loss of attachment of  $< 2\text{mm}$  were not detected as such. Consequently, an evaluation of parameters usually underestimated predictive values in a given time.

As it was recognized that the extent and severity of previous disease is helpful in identifying individuals at risk of further disease progression (Haffajee & Oliver 1990) efforts focused on tooth and site based predictions. While originally single parameters such as bleeding on probing (BOP) (Lang et al. 1986), suppuration and probing pocket depth (PPD) (Claffey et al. 1990) were evaluated for their ability to

Accepted Article

predict disease progression, it was soon realized that the positive predictive values of these parameters were at best approximately 30%. Hence, the search for additional parameters and combinations of parameters was necessary.

Lang and Tonetti (1996) suggested the need for a continuous multilevel risk assessment at the patient, tooth and tooth site level to improve predictive values. While tooth and site based risk assessment using the severity of the lesion (pocket depth, attachment loss, remaining bone support, furcation involvement) and inflammation (BOP) had been clinically utilized, the challenge was the incorporation of subject-based factors.

The systematic assessment of known risk factors discussed at the World Workshop on Periodontics (Papapanou 1996; Tonetti 1998) highlighted that known risk factors for periodontitis could be clustered in 7 groups: aetiology, genetic predisposition, medical conditions, lifestyle, psychological profile, access to care and background factors. Each of these groups of factors may confer increased susceptibility to disease onset and progression. In his paper, in the first attempt to account for the multidimensional nature of patient-based risk, Tonetti (1998) proposed the use of a target diagram to communicate and manage the multidimensional risk of periodontitis progression.

Clinical implication of the principles, however, required the development and validation of tools to measure and communicate risk in its multiple dimensions. The significance of single subject attributes or exposure to outcomes of periodontal supportive care has been recently systematically reviewed (Chambrone et al. 2010). In that systematic review, different patient-related factors (i.e. age and smoking) and tooth-related factors (tooth type and location, and the initial tooth prognosis) were associated with tooth loss during supportive periodontal care. No systematic review is available to understand the predictive value of multiple factors for periodontitis progression and tooth loss in treated populations.

The specific aims of this review were to: i) identify the characteristics of currently published patient-based tools or systems used to assess levels of risk for periodontitis progression; and ii) systematically review the evidence documenting the

use of patient-based risk assessment tools for predicting periodontitis progression. For the second aim, the focused question was: “*Are results from current patient-based risk assessment tools predictive of periodontitis progression in adults treated for this disease?*”

## **Materials & methods**

### *Scope*

The focus of this review was to provide a comprehensive summary of the evidence of existing tools or methods proposed to assess patient level risk for the progression of periodontitis. Hence, inclusion criteria were set to be broad and inclusive. Study designs eligible for inclusion were randomized controlled clinical trials and cohort studies for answering the focused question of prediction. Cross-sectional studies were included in the summary of currently reported risk assessment tools. Risk assessment tools for peri-implant disease initiation or progression were not within the scope of this review.

Any published risk assessment tool was considered. For this review, a risk assessment tool was defined to include any composite measure of patient level risk directed towards determining the probability for further disease progression in adults with periodontitis. Periodontitis was defined to include both chronic and aggressive forms in adult populations. Periodontitis progression outcomes included changes in attachment levels and/or deepening of periodontal pockets in millimetres in study populations undergoing supportive periodontal therapy (SPT) (Tonetti & Claffey 2005).

### *Search and Screening*

The electronic search strategy included the search of electronic databases to July 2014 using terms and strategy set *a priori* according to each database (Cochrane Library, Ovid MEDLINE, EMBASE and LILACS). No language or year restrictions were applied. Hand searching comprised of checking bibliographic references of included articles and related review articles. In addition, on-line hand searching of recent issues of key periodontal journals from the previous 5 years was performed (Journal of Clinical Periodontology, Journal of Dental Research, Journal of

Periodontal Research, Journal of Periodontology, Oral Health and Preventive Dentistry).

The electronic search strategy framework was developed based on risk assessment tools and periodontitis search terms and then tested to confirm its suitability to the focus of the review. It was customised as appropriate before application to each database. Table S1 provides an example of the basic search strategy.

Titles and abstracts (when available) of all reports identified through the search were scanned by two reviewers independently (JES and NPL). Full reports were obtained and reviewed independently for studies appearing to meet the inclusion criteria or for which there was insufficient information in the title and abstract to allow a clear decision (JES and NPL).

#### *Bias Protection Assessment*

Bias protection assessment of included studies was undertaken independently and in duplicate by two reviewers. Studies were assessed using the validated Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale as recommended by the Cochrane Collaboration Guidelines for the assessment of non-randomised studies (Wells et al. 2009). These tools award stars (\*) in three categories for each study based on incorporation of design elements associated with minimising bias. Due to a lack of validated tools to assess the risk of bias of cross sectional studies, cross-sectional studies were not evaluated.

#### *Data Abstraction*

Data were abstracted from full text articles directly into electronically generated evidence table templates. Data abstraction was performed on all included studies independently and in collaboration (JES and NPL). Completed evidence tables were rechecked to validate accuracy of the data abstraction (JES, NPL, MT).

## *Data synthesis*

### *Descriptive Methods*

Descriptive summary was performed by summarizing the studies in evidence tables to determine the quantity of data, checking further for study variations in study characteristics (populations, outcomes, design, quality and results). Bias protection assessment was also summarised in table format. Evidence tables provided the framework to assess data suitability for further quantitative analyses such as meta-analysis.

### *Quantitative Methods*

Due to the heterogeneity of the studies, data were not adequate to warrant performing a meta-analysis.

## **Results**

### **Search Results**

The electronic search provided 388 citations, including 61 duplicate publications. Hand searching provided 9 additional citations. 336 titles and abstracts were screened in duplicate (Kappa score for screening agreement 0.95, 95% CI 0.90 to 0.99). Figure 1 illustrates the PRISMA flow diagram. 303 irrelevant citations were excluded, confirming the broad nature of the search. The majority of these contained information pertaining to associations of specific risk factors to periodontitis. Moreover, articles about risk factors for caries and periapical lesions as well as narrative reviews were amongst the excluded titles and abstracts.

All 33 potentially relevant full text articles were screened independently in duplicate according to the eligibility criteria. Reviewers were in full agreement on inclusion of articles. This last screening excluded 14 citations that did not provide evidence for risk assessment tools or were duplicate publications of already included articles, or were narrative summaries or comments (Busby et al. 2013; Chapple 2007; Giannobile et al. 2013; Martin et al 2009, Martin et al 2011, Matuliene et al. 2008; Page et al. 2002; Page et al. 2005; Persson et al. 2003a; Persson et al. 2003c;



Renvert et al. 2004; Sandberg 2004; Sandberg & Fors 2007; Thyvalikakath et al. 2013). Detailed reasons for exclusion are reported in Table S2.

### ***Characteristics of included studies***

All evidence was published within the last 13 years and 10 articles were published since 2010. 3 included articles reported a risk assessment tool without providing supporting data (Fors and Sandberg 2001, Lang & Tonetti 2003, Teich et al 2013). Evidence comprised 10 cohort studies; in 7 of these, risk was calculated retrospectively at the end of the follow-up period using available baseline data (Jansson & Norderyd 2008; Eickholz et al. 2008; Leininger et al. 2010; Lü et al. 2013; Martin et al. 2010, Matuliene et al. 2010; Page et al. 2003); in 1 risk was calculated retrospectively using data assessed at the end of the study (Meyer-Bäumer et al. 2012), while 2 studies were conducted fully with a prospective design (Costa et al. 2012; Lindskog et al. 2010). 6 cross sectional studies were also identified (Busby et al. 2014; Chandra 2007; Eshwar et al. 2010; Persson et al. 2003b; Renvert & Persson 2004; Trombelli et al. 2009).

### ***Aim 1. Summary of identified patient-based periodontal risk assessment tools.***

The 19 included studies reported on different patient-based periodontal risk assessment tools. A total of five risk assessment tools were identified in the current review. Five publications dealt with the DenPlan Excel/Previsor® Patient Assessment (DEPPA) and its modifications (Busby et al 2014; Martin et al. 2010, Page et al. 2002; Persson et al. 2003b; Trombelli, et al. 2009). One article described the HIDEP model, a computerized tool that used predetermined risk groups for selecting and managing individual treatment and prevention schemes (Fors & Sandberg 2001). One article presented the Risk Assessment-Based Individualized Treatment (RABIT) (Teich 2013). One study (Lindskog et al. 2010) described the Dentition Risk System (DRS) at both the patient and tooth level. 12 publications reported on the Periodontal Risk Assessment (PRA) and its modifications (Chandra 2007; Eickholz et al. 2008; Costa et al. 2012; Eshwar et al. 2010; Jansson & Norderyd 2008; Lang & Tonetti 2003; Leininger et al. 2010; Lü et al. 2013; Matuliene et al. 2010; Meyer-Bäumer et al. 2012; Persson et al. 2003c; Renvert & Persson 2004).

Table 1 displays the characteristics and the parameters utilized by these tools. A qualitative analysis indicates that the parameters that are taken into account are to a large degree the same even though differences are evident with regards to the actual assessment of the parameters. Furthermore, the majority of the tools are variations of few basic approaches and in particular of the Periodontal Risk Calculator, PRC (Page et al. 2002) and of the Periodontal Risk Assessment, PRA (Lang & Tonetti 2003). Variations frequently addressed different ways of assessing the parameters included either in PRC or PRA.

A total of 6 studies reporting on 1078 patients had a cross-sectional design and reported comparisons of different risk assessment tools and/or measures of adjusted and unadjusted associations between periodontal outcomes and the subject risk stratification provided by the assessment tools (Table S3).

### ***Aim 2. Prediction of periodontitis progression***

10 included studies (Table 3) had a cohort design and reported on a total of 2130 patients. The observation period spanned from 3 years to 12 years. The time at risk (follow-up time) was different for the different subjects enrolled in each study in 5 of 10 studies. In general, these studies report that the risk assessment tool was able to effectively separate subjects with different probability of disease progression and tooth loss. The observed effect was dose-dependent (the higher the estimation of risk the higher the level of observed disease progression and/or tooth loss).

One study (Page et al. 2002) assessed the predictive value of risk estimation with the Periodontal Risk Calculator (PRC), also known as PreViser® in a largely untreated population. This study enrolled 523 men of the VA Dental Longitudinal Study with data gathered over 15 years. The risk scores applied were strong predictors for the periodontal status as measured by alveolar bone loss of periodontally affected teeth. Increasing risk scores after 15 years also revealed increasing numbers of teeth lost. A risk score of 2 corresponded to a loss of 0.5 teeth, a risk score of 3 to a loss of 1.6 teeth, a risk score of 4 a tooth loss of 2.4 teeth and a risk score of 5 a tooth loss of 5.8 teeth. The authors recommended the PRC as a predictive tool for risk assessment in clinical decision-making. It should be noted that determining risk subjectively by expert clinicians tended to underestimate the

periodontitis risk compared to the PRC. Another study utilizing the PRC system reported on 776 SPC patients from 9 periodontal practices (Martin et al 2010).

Another prospective cohort study (Lindskog et al. 2010) provided evidence for the Dentition Risk System (DRS), a proposed combination of factors in assessing disease progression at both the patient (dentition) and the tooth level in a population comprising 183 subjects.

Seven studies reporting on 648 subjects assessed the predictive value of risk estimation with the PRA or its modifications as a predictive tool for periodontal disease progression (Costa et al. 2012; Jansson & Norderyd 2008; Eickholz et al. 2008; Leininger et al. 2010; Lü et al. 2013; Matuliene et al. 2010; Meyer-Bäumer et al. 2012). With the exception of one retrospective cohort study with 20 subjects and a mean follow-up of 5 years (Jansson & Norderyd 2008), 6 of the 7 cohort studies reported on a total of 628 subjects followed for 3 to 12 years (Eickholz et al. 2008; Costa et al. 2012; Leininger, et al. 2010; Lü et al. 2013; Matuliene et al. 2010; Meyer-Bäumer et al. 2012). All provided a longitudinal external validation of the PRA as a predictive tool for periodontitis progression and tooth loss. The study that failed to report an association between PRA score and periodontitis progression (Jansson & Norderyd 2008) assessed risk before treatment and after five years, while all other studies assessed PRA at the end of active therapy. Matuliene et al. (2010) reported that subjects with a Low Risk profile experienced an average tooth loss of 1.8 teeth (S.D. 1.9 teeth), subjects with a Middle Risk profile 1.02 teeth (S.D. 1.8 teeth) and subjects with a High Risk profile 2.59 teeth (S.D. 3.9 teeth) (Matuliene et al. 2010). In a Chinese study with 88 patients (Lü et al. 2013), a modified PRA was used to evaluate treatment outcomes in severe generalized aggressive periodontitis. High Risk patients showed more tooth loss and less bone fill than Low Risk or Moderate Risk patients. Another cohort study reporting on PRA in generalized aggressive periodontitis patients, reported more tooth loss and shorter time to the first tooth loss event in PRA defined high risk individuals compared to low risk and moderate risk (Meyer-Bäumer et al. 2012). This latter study, however, retrieved risk profile data at follow-up rather than after active periodontal therapy.

Based on the Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale for the prospective and retrospective cohort study design (Wells et al. 2009), 6 studies met the criteria to be categorised as being at low risk of bias, while 4 studies were at medium risk of bias. No retrieved study evaluated in a comparative way the effect of knowledge of the risk assessment profile on the management of the patient.

## **Discussion**

This systematic review identified five periodontal risk assessment tools in the literature. These employed assessment of a small set of well documented risk factors and indicators. Differences consisted mainly of the methods of estimation of the different parameters, their number and the inclusion of tooth or site specific factors. Among these, three tools - and their variations - have been assessed in longitudinal studies. One tool termed the Periodontal Risk Calculator or PRC was studied in two studies from the USA (Page et al. 2002, Martin et al 2010). Another tool, the Periodontal Risk Assessment or PRA (Lang & Tonetti 2003) was tested in a total of 7 studies including 648 subjects. One of the seven studies with a very limited number of subjects (n=20) was unable to attribute a predictive function for periodontitis progression or tooth loss to the Periodontal Risk Assessment (PRA), but the other six studies confirmed such predictive value. Authors commented that this result may have been influenced by a more aggressive treatment approach including more extractions at initial therapy as baseline was defined as before initial therapy. The last tool, the Dentition Risk System was evaluated in 183 individuals recruited by 7 dental practitioners from 5 clinics in Sweden (Lindskog et al. 2010).

Taken together, these data support the possibility to predict periodontitis progression and tooth loss in a treated population based on risk segmentation using these tools. No data, however, is available on the impact that such risk assessment may have on patient management. In this respect the use of risk assessment to determine the frequency of supportive periodontal care appointments has been proposed along with the idea that it may help in treatment planning. While rationale, these suggestions remain unsubstantiated. In this situation of incomplete knowledge, however, clinicians may wish to consider application of risk assessment tools to improve their ability to identify, communicate and manage the multifactorial nature of periodontitis. Both PRC and PRA seem well suited to satisfy the goals proposed with

Accepted Article

patient-based risk assessment (Tonetti 1998). It appears, however, particularly important to emphasize that risk segmentation of recall populations with PRA or its modifications have been validated in multiple populations and settings around the world (Brazil, China, France, Germany, India, Sweden, and Switzerland) increasing the generalizability and external validity of the tool and therefore, the potential applicability to clinical practice.

## References

- Busby, M., Chapple, E., Matthews, R., & Chapple, I.L. 2013. Practitioner evaluation of a novel online integrated oral health and risk assessment tool: a practice pilot.[Erratum appears in Br Dent J. 2013 Sep;215(5):212]. *British Dental Journal*, 215, (3) 115-120
- Busby, M., Chapple, L., Matthews, R., Burke, F.J., & Chapple, I. 2014. Continuing development of an oral health score for clinical audit. *Br.Dent.J.*, 216, (9) E20 available from: PM:24809589
- Chambrone, L., Chambrone, D., Lima, L.A., & Chambrone, L.A. 2010. Predictors of tooth loss during long-term periodontal maintenance: a systematic review of observational studies. *J.Clin.Periodontol.*, 37, (7) 675-684 available from: PM:20528960
- Chandra, R.V. 2007. Evaluation of a novel periodontal risk assessment model in patients presenting for dental care. *Oral Health & Preventive Dentistry*, 5, (1) 39-48
- Chapple, I.L. 2007. Management of periodontal diseases within the NHS three years on: are things any better? *British Dental Journal*, 202, (9) 569-570
- Claffey, N., Nylund, K., Kiger, R., Garrett, S., & Egelberg, J. 1990. Diagnostic predictability of scores of plaque, bleeding, suppuration and probing depth for probing attachment loss. 3 ½ years of observation following initial periodontal therapy. *J.Clin.Periodontol.*, 17, (2) 108-114 available from: PM:2406292
- Costa, F.O., Cota, L.O., Lages, E.J., Lima Oliveira, A.P., Cortelli, S.C., Cortelli, J.R., Lorentz, T.C., & Costa, J.E. 2012. Periodontal risk assessment model in a sample of regular and irregular compliers under maintenance therapy: a 3-year prospective study. *Journal of Periodontology*, 83, (3) 292-300
- Eickholz, P., Kaltschmitt, J., Berbig, J., Reitmeir, P. & Pretzl, B. (2008) Tooth loss after active periodontal therapy. 1: patient-related factors for risk, prognosis, and quality of outcome. *J. Clin. Periodontol.* 35, 165–174.

- Eshwar, S., Ankola, A.V., Kumar, A., & Hebbal, M. 2010. Evaluation of periodontal risk assessment model among adults aged 30-60 years attending KLE Dental College, Belgaum: A hospital-based study. *Journal of Indian Society of Periodontology*, 14, (3) 173-177
- Fors, U.G. & Sandberg, H.C. 2001. Computer-aided risk management—a software tool for the Hidep model. *Quintessence International*, 32, (4) 309-320
- Giannobile, W.V., Braun, T.M., Caplis, A.K., Doucette-Stamm, L., Duff, G.W., & Kornman, K.S. 2013. Patient stratification for preventive care in dentistry. *J.Dent.Res.*, 92, (8) 694-701 available from: PM:23752171
- Haffajee & Oliver 1990, Periodontal Diseases Working Group Summary and Recommendations In: Bader JD, editor. Risk Assessment in Dentistry, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Dental Ecology..
- Jansson, H. & Norderyd, O. 2008. Evaluation of a periodontal risk assessment model in subjects with severe periodontitis. A 5-year retrospective study. *Swedish Dental Journal*, 32, (1) 1-7
- Lang, N.P., Joss, A., Orsanic, T., Gusberti, F.A., & Siegrist, B.E. 1986. Bleeding on probing. A predictor for the progression of periodontal disease? *J.Clin.Periodontol.*, 13, (6) 590-596 available from: PM:3489010
- Lang, N.P. & Tonetti, M.S. 1996. Periodontal diagnosis in treated periodontitis. Why, when and how to use clinical parameters. [Review] [102 refs]. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 23, (3:Pt 2) t-50
- Lang, N.P. & Tonetti, M.S. 2003. Periodontal risk assessment (PRA) for patients in supportive periodontal therapy (SPT). *Oral Health & Preventive Dentistry*, 1, (1) 7-16
- Leininger, M., Tenenbaum, H., & Davideau, J.L. 2010. Modified periodontal risk assessment score: long-term predictive value of treatment outcomes. A retrospective study. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 37, (5) 427-435
- Lindskog, S., Blomlof, J., Persson, I., Niklason, A., Hedin, A., Ericsson, L., Ericsson, M., Jarncrantz, B., Palo, U., Tellefsen, G., Zetterstrom, O., & Blomlof, L. 2010. Validation of an algorithm for chronic periodontitis risk assessment and prognostication: risk predictors, explanatory values, measures of quality, and clinical use. *Journal of Periodontology*, 81, (4) 584-593
- Lü, D., Meng, H., Xu, L., Lu, R., Zhang, L., Chen, Z., Feng, X., Shi, D., Tian, Y., & Wang, X. 2013. New attempts to modify periodontal risk assessment for generalized

aggressive periodontitis: a retrospective study. *Journal of Periodontology*, 84:1536-1545

Martin J., Page R., Loeb C., Kaye E., 2011 Reduction of Tooth Loss Associated with Periodontal Treatment. *International Journal of Periodontics and Restorative Dentistry*. 31:471-9.

Martin J., Page R., Loeb C., Levi P Jr., 2010. Tooth Loss in 776 Treated Periodontal Patients. *Journal of Periodontology*, Feb;81(2):244-50.

Martin J., Page R., Kaye E., Hamed, MT., Loeb C., 2009. Periodontitis Severity Plus Risk as a Tooth Loss Predictor. *Journal of Periodontology*,:80:202-9

Matuliene, G., Pjetursson, B.E., Salvi, G.E., Schmidlin, K., Bragger, U., Zwahlen, M., & Lang, N.P. 2008. Influence of residual pockets on progression of periodontitis and tooth loss: results after 11 years of maintenance. *J.Clin.Periodontol.*, 35, (8) 685-695 available from: PM:18549447

Matuliene, G., Studer, R., Lang, N.P., Schmidlin, K., Pjetursson, B.E., Salvi, G.E., Bragger, U., & Zwahlen, M. 2010. Significance of Periodontal Risk Assessment in the recurrence of periodontitis and tooth loss. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 37, (2) 191-199

Meyer-Bäumer, A., Pritsch, M., Cosgarea, R., El, S.N., Kim, T.S., Eickholz, P., & Pretzl, B. 2012. Prognostic value of the periodontal risk assessment in patients with aggressive periodontitis. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 39, (7) 651-658

Page, R.C., Krall, E.A., Martin, J., Mancl, L., & Garcia, R.I. 2002. Validity and accuracy of a risk calculator in predicting periodontal disease. *Journal of the American Dental Association*, 133, (5) 569-576

Page, R.C., Martin, J., Krall, E.A., Mancl, L., & Garcia, R. 2003. Longitudinal validation of a risk calculator for periodontal disease. *J.Clin.Periodontol.*, 30, (9) 819-827 available from: PM:12956658

Page, R.C., Martin, J.A., & Loeb, C.F. 2005. The Oral Health Information Suite (OHIS): its use in the management of periodontal disease. *Journal of Dental Education*, 69, (5) 509-520

Papapanou, P.N. 1996. Periodontal diseases: epidemiology. *Ann.Periodontol.*, 1, (1) 1-36 available from: PM:9118256

Persson, G.R., Attström, R., Lang, N.P., & Page, R.C. 2003a. Perceived risk of deteriorating periodontal conditions. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 30, (11) 982-989



- Persson, G.R., Mancl, L.A., Martin, J., & Page, R.C. 2003b. Assessing periodontal disease risk: a comparison of clinicians' assessment versus a computerized tool. *Journal of the American Dental Association*, 134, (5) 575-582
- Persson, G.R., Matuliene, G., Ramseier, C.A., Persson, R.E., Tonetti, M.S., & Lang, N.P. 2003c. Influence of interleukin-1 gene polymorphism on the outcome of supportive periodontal therapy explored by a multi-factorial periodontal risk assessment model (PRA). *Oral Health & Preventive Dentistry*, 1, (1) 17-27
- Renvert, S., Ohlsson, O., Persson, S., Lang, N.P., & Persson, G.R. 2004. Analysis of periodontal risk profiles in adults with or without a history of myocardial infarction. *J.Clin.Periodontol.*, 31, (1) 19-24 available from: PM:15058370
- Renvert, S. & Persson, G.R. 2004. Patient-based assessments of clinical periodontal conditions in relation to alveolar bone loss. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 31, (3) 208-213
- Sandberg, H. 2004. Practice management based on risk assessment. *Oral Health & Preventive Dentistry*, 2, Suppl-9
- Sandberg, H.C. & Fors, U.G. 2007. The HIDEP model—a straightforward dental health care model for prevention-based practice management. *Swedish Dental Journal*, 31, (4) 171-179
- Socransky, S.S., Haffajee, A.D., Goodson, J.M., & Lindhe, J. 1984. New concepts of destructive periodontal disease. *J.Clin.Periodontol.*, 11, (1) 21-32 available from: PM:6582072
- Teich, S.T. 2013. Risk Assessment-Based Individualized Treatment (RABIT): a comprehensive approach to dental patient recall. *Journal of Dental Education*, 77, (4) 448-457
- Thyvalikakath, T.P., Padman, R., & Gupta, S. 2013. An integrated risk assessment tool for team-based periodontal disease management. *Studies in Health Technology & Informatics*, 192, 1150
- Tonetti, M.S. 1998. Cigarette smoking and periodontal diseases: etiology and management of disease. *Ann.Periodontol.*, 3, (1) 88-101 available from: PM:9722693
- Tonetti, M.S. & Claffey, N. 2005. Advances in the progression of periodontitis and proposal of definitions of a periodontitis case and disease progression for use in risk factor research. Group C consensus report of the 5<sup>th</sup> European Workshop in



Periodontology. *J.Clin.Periodontol.*, 32 Suppl 6, 210-213 available from:  
PM:16128839

Trombelli, L., Farina, R., Ferrari, S., Pasetti, P., & Calura, G. 2009. Comparison between two methods for periodontal risk assessment. *Minerva Stomatologica*, 58, (6) 277-287

Wells GA, Shea B, O'Connell D, Peterson J, Welch V, Losos M, & Tugwell P. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. <http://www.lri.ca/programs/ceu/oxford.htm>. 2009. Department of Epidemiology and Community Medicine, University of Ottawa, Canada.

**Table 1. Summary of Identified Risk Assessment Tools**

Author (country) Study Type	Risk Assessment Tool Description	Parameters utilized in Tool	Objective
<i>Fors &amp; Sandberg</i> 2001  (Sweden)	<b>Health Improvement in Dental Practice Model (HIDEP)</b> Computerized tool that uses predefined risk groups for selecting and managing individual treatment and prevention schemes. The model does not use new risk estimation techniques, but combines already available examination methods, risk estimation systems, and treatment suggestions into a new entity. Tool designed to assess the risk of other aspects of oral health in addition to periodontal status	Total number of teeth□, total number of intact teeth (teeth without restorations, caries, or crowns, number of caries lesions (initial lesions included), caries experience□, fluoride exposure,□ saliva diagnostics (including secretion, buffering capacity, lactobacilli criteria, and <i>streptococcus mutans</i> ), sugar intake frequency□, oral hygiene screening, professional risk estimation for caries and periodontitis□, gingival bleeding□, probing of periodontal pockets, radiographic examination, registration of tartar and/or overhang	To create and evaluate a computerized tool capable of creating overviews of the oral health situation as well as identifying risk factors and at-risk patients. Consists of 5 risk and 4 disease categories for both caries and periodontal diseases. Scores assigned according to 14 parameters. Final result places patients on a health-disease scale and low or high risk for disease scale for both caries and periodontal disease
<i>Page et al.</i> 2003  (USA)	<b>Periodontal Risk Calculator (PRC)</b> Computer based tool that is periodontal risk assessment focused. Based upon information obtained from clinical periodontal examination (later incorporated with additional oral health risk assessment tools to form PreViser). Generated risk score is the results of mathematically derived algorithms that assign relative weights to the various factors that enhance patients' susceptibility to develop periodontitis	Calculation of risk involves mathematical algorithms using nine parameters: age, smoking history, diabetes, history of periodontal surgery, pocket depth, furcation involvements, restorations or calculus below the gingival margin, radiographic bone height, vertical bone lesions	To provide a risk score of a patients' susceptibility for periodontal progression on a scale of 1 (lowest risk) to 5 (highest risk).
<i>Lang &amp; Tonetti</i> 2003  (Switzerland)	<b>Periodontal Risk Assessment Model (PRA)</b> A functional diagram (spider web shape) formulated based upon the combination of various parameters that have been proposed in scientific literature as impacting the patient risk for further disease progression.	Estimation of patient level risk involves using six parameters: Bone loss/age, Number of pockets ≥ 5 mm, number of missing teeth, percentage of sites with BOP, cigarette smoking, Systemic factors (such as diabetes and IL-1 gene polymorphism)	To classify patients as low, medium, or high risk for periodontal disease progression.
Author (country)	Risk Assessment Tool Description	Parameters utilized in Tool	Objective

Study Type			
Chandra 2007 (India)	<b>Modified Periodontal Risk Assessment Model (Modified PRA)</b> A new periodontal risk assessment model based on the periodontal risk assessment (PRA) model by Lang and Tonetti that was targeted to be: 1/ easier to generate and use 2/ would assess diabetes on an individual radius 3/ would incorporate dental factors 3/ would include "others factors" such as stress and socio-economic factors	Based upon the design of the PRA, 4 factors of the PRA are retained: BOP, no of sites with PD $\geq$ 5mm, tooth loss and smoking. Additional factors are re-defined or included: Diabetic status, AL/age, dental status-systemic factors interplay and other background characteristics. Differences from PRA are that 1/ environmental factors, systemic and genetic factors are specifically defined as diabetes status and interplay of dental-systemic factors that accounts for dental factors. 2/ bone loss/age is replaced with attachment level/age 3/ other background factors are included to include estimated socio-economic or stress factors. 4/ the scores on each trajectory ranged between 1 and 5/ based on a coding system rather than using actual factor thresholds such as bleeding on probing percent, or numbers of pockets $\geq$ 5 mm	To classify individuals as low, medium or high risk for periodontal disease progression
Trombelli et al. 2009 (Italy)	<b>University of Ferrara(UniFe)</b> A proposed simplified method for periodontal risk assessment based upon five parameters derived from patient medical history and clinical recordings. Each parameter assessed is allocated a parameter score according to defined criteria. The algebraic sum of the parameter scores is calculated and relates to a risk score between 1 and 5.	Smoking status, Diabetic status, Number of sites with probing depth $\geq$ 5 mm, Bleeding on probing score (BoP) Bone loss/age	To provide a risk score of a patients' susceptibility for periodontal progression on a scale of 1 (lowest risk) to 5 (highest risk).
Lindskog et al. 2010 (Sweden)	<b>DRS a patient risk score (DRSdentition) or tooth risk score (DRStooth).</b> A Web-based analytic tool that calculates chronic periodontitis risk for the dentition (Level I) and, if an elevated risk is found, prognosticates disease progression tooth by tooth (Level II).	<b>Systemic predictors:</b> age, family history of periodontitis, systemic disease, skin test result (assesses patient's inflammatory reactivity), patient compliance and disease awareness, socioeconomic status, smoking habits, therapist's experience with periodontal care <b>Local predictors:</b> - plaque, endodontic pathology, furcation	To provide a dentition (patient level) risk score based upon systemic and local predictors. It allows for further risk assessment at the tooth level if patient level risk is found to be elevated.

		involvement, angular bony destruction, radiographic marginal bone loss, pocket depth, bleeding on probing, marginal dental restorations, tooth mobility	
Author (country) Study Type	Risk Assessment Tool Description	Parameters utilized in Tool	Objective
Teich 2013 (USA)	<p><b>Risk Assessment Based Individualized Treatment (RABIT)</b></p> <p>Advocates a modified approach that supports individualized risk-based recall schedules not only after active therapy is completed but also during the course of treatment. Approach assesses risk of other aspects of oral health in addition to periodontal status</p>	Computer system assigns a risk level based upon caries risk assessment and periodontal risk assessment. The specific parameters used to generate the level of risk are not reported in the paper (reported as developed according to existing evidence)	To classify patients as low, medium, or high risk for periodontal disease progression or caries risk with accompanying recommendation for maintenance visit interval
Lü et al. 2013 (China)	<p><b>PRA (as proposed by Lang &amp; Tonetti 2003):</b> Bone loss/age, Number of pockets <math>\geq 5</math> mm, number of missing teeth, percentage of sites with BOP, cigarette smoking, diabetes and IL-1 gene polymorphism</p> <p><b>Modified MPRA</b> is an alternate modification of the PRA that replaces BOP with bleeding index <math>\geq 2</math>, counting sites with PPD <math>\geq 6</math> mm, calculating full-mouth average Bone Loss over age</p>	<p><b>MPRA Model 1:</b> BL <math>&gt; 2</math>, PD <math>\geq 6</math> mm (four sites per tooth), Tooth Loss, Bone Loss (worst site /age), Smoking, Systemic disease</p> <p><b>MPRA Model 2:</b> BL <math>&gt; 2</math>, PD <math>\geq 6</math> mm (four sites per tooth), Tooth L, Bone Loss (mean /age), Smoking, Systemic disease</p> <p><b>MPRA Model 3:</b> BL <math>&gt; 2</math>, PD <math>\geq 6</math> mm (six sites per tooth), Tooth Loss, Bone Loss (mean /age), Smoking, Systemic disease</p>	To classify patients as low, medium, or high risk for periodontal disease progression.
Busby et al. 2014 (UK)	<p><b>Oral Health Status (OHS) as part of DenPlan Excel/Previsor Patient Assessment (DEPPA)</b></p> <p>On-line assessment tool that incorporates PreViser™ risk scores for periodontal disease, caries, non-caries tooth surface loss, and oral cancer, revised versions of DenPlan Excel's Oral Health Score, and capitation fee guidance</p>	Pocketing and bleeding based upon BPE result in patient score for: Healthy periodontium, Gingivitis only, Mild periodontal disease, Moderate periodontal disease, Severe periodontal disease	To provide patient level risk scores for periodontal disease, caries, and oral cancer.

Table 2.  
Longitudinal Studies Reporting Periodontitis Progression or Tooth Loss Based on Risk Stratification with Multidimensional Tools

Author (country) Study Type	Population/Samp le/Condition	Follow-up (Time at risk in years)	Risk Assessment Tool Description (included parameters)	Results	Risk of Bias (Newcastle- Ottawa scale)	Study Conclusions
Page et al. 2003 (USA)  Retrospective Cohort Study	N = 523 General population: Men enrolled in the Veterans Administration Dental Longitudinal Study Age range 25-74 years Smokers n=101 Diabetics n=9	Follow-up after 3, 9 and 12 years	<b>PRC</b> Computer based tool periodontal risk assessment focused. Provides a risk score on a scale of 1 (lowest risk) to 5 (highest risk). Calculation of risk based upon mathematical algorithms using nine risk factors: age, smoking history, diabetes, history of periodontal surgery, pocket depth, furcation involvements, restorations or calculus below the gingival margin, radiographic bone height, vertical bone lesions	Risk scores were strong predictors of periodontal status, as measured by alveolar bone loss and loss of periodontally affected teeth. Risk scores consistently ranked risk score groups from least to most bone loss and tooth loss. Compared with a risk score of 2, the relative risk of tooth loss was 3.2 for a risk score of 3, 4.5 for a risk score of 4 and 10.6 for a risk score of 5. Mean number of teeth lost at 15 years (risk group based upon baseline risk score): Risk score 2: 0.5 teeth Risk score 3: 1.8 teeth Risk score 4: 2.4 teeth Risk score 5: 5.8 teeth	Low	<b>Risk assessed by PRC significantly predicted outcomes in terms of periodontitis progression and tooth loss.</b>
Jansson et al. 2008 (Sweden)  Retrospective Cohort Study	N = 20 Periodontitis patients treated and in supportive periodontal care Mean age=48.4 years Age range 33-67 years Tobacco users n=12 Diabetics n=1	5 year follow-up	<b>PRA</b> Periodontal risk hexagon diagram proposed by Lang & Tonetti (2003) . Included parameters were: Percentage BOP, number of residuals pockets with probing depths $\geq 5$ mm, number of teeth lost, bone loss/age ratio, systemic or genetic factors (diabetes or IL-1 gene polymorphism), environmental factors (smoking status).	13 patients categorised as high risk 7 patients categorized as moderate risk - Individuals with BOP $\leq 20\%$ had a mean loss of 3.5 teeth - Individuals with BOP $>20\%$ had mean loss of 1 tooth - mean reduction of sites with PD $>5$ mm was similar magnitude in both groups; BOP $\leq 20\%$ and BOP $>20\%$ (22% and 19% respectively)	Low	<b>Risk assessed by PRA did not significantly predict outcomes in terms of tooth loss.</b>
Eickholz et al.	N = 100	10 year	<b>PRA</b>	Significant risk factors identified by	Medium	<b>Risk assessed by</b>

2008  (Germany)  Retrospective Cohort Study	Periodontitis patients in supportive periodontal therapy for 10 years. 53 were SPT compliers, 47 were erratic compliers	follow-up	Modification of Periodontal Risk Hexagon diagram proposed by Lang & Tonetti (2003). BOPpercentage, mean PII, IL-1 polymorphism, smoking history, complying with the SPT schedule were assessed 10 years following active periodontal therapy	<i>Poisson regressions</i> as contributing factors for tooth loss were: Mean Plaque Index during SPT, irregular attendance of SPT, age, initial diagnosis, IL-1 polymorphism, smoking and gender,		<b>PRA significantly predicted outcomes in terms of tooth loss.</b>
<i>Leiniger et al. 2010</i>  (France)  Retrospective Cohort Study	N = 30 Untreated periodontitis patients assessed before and following treatment Low-to-moderate risk n=17 High risk n=13 Mean age=51.0 yrs Age range 22-67 yrs Males = 50% Smokers = 40% Diabetic n=1	Follow-up between 6-12 years	<b>PRA</b> Periodontal risk hexagon diagram proposed by Lang & Tonetti (2003):  Included parameters were: Percentage BOP, number of residuals pockets with probing depths ≥5mm, number of teeth lost, bone loss/age ratio, systemic or genetic factors (diabetes or IL-1 gene polymorphism), environmental factors (smoking status).	Tooth loss = 0.11 for the low-to-moderate-risk group, 0.26 for the high-risk group (p=0.05).  PPD reduction=2.57 and 2.17, respectively, and bleeding on probing reduction was 6.7% and 23.3%, respectively.  No. PPD sites reduction was 3.39 in the compliant group and 1.40 in the non-compliant group (p=0.05).	Medium	<b>Risk assessed by PRA significantly predicted outcomes in terms of periodontitis progression and tooth loss.</b>
<i>Lindskog et al. 2010</i>  (Sweden)  Prospective Cohort Study	N =183 Approx. 35 patients per practice in 5 clinics (clinicians included 3 periodontal specialists and 4 general dentists). Consecutive patients attending clinics (with and	Follow-up time point about 4 years	<b>DRS</b> a patient risk score (DRSdentition) or tooth risk score (DRStooth). Systemic predictors: - age, family history of perio, systemic disease, skin test result (assesses patient's inflammatory reactivity), patient compliance and disease awareness, socioeconomic status, smoking habits, therapist's experience with periodontal care Local predictors: - plaque, endodontic pathology, furcation	Total number teeth lost amongst sample during the observation period were 66 or 2.25%. - 21.3% of patients lost teeth 31.8% of 107 patients with DRSdentition >0.5 lost teeth compared to 5 of 76 patients (6.6%) with DRSdentition score <0.5.	Low	<b>Risk assessed by DRS significantly predicted outcomes in terms of tooth loss.</b>

	without periodontitis) then treated accordingly Mean age=47.9 yrs Males=47%		involvement, angular bony destruction, radiographic marginal bone loss, pocket depth, bleeding on probing, marginal dental restorations, tooth mobility			
<i>Martin et al 2010</i> (USA) Retrospective Cohort Study	N=776 Periodontitis patients treated and in supportive periodontal care Patients recruited by 9 periodontists with target of 100 per specialist Risk and disease severity scored at baseline and after follow-up. Low risk = 0.6% Moderate risk = 7.9% High risk = 36.6% Very high risk level = 54.9% Age range =46.0±10.5 years	Follow-up Mean – 13.2±7 years	<b>PRC</b> Computer based tool periodontal risk assessment focused. Provides a risk score on a scale of 1 (lowest risk) to 5 (highest risk). Calculation of risk based upon mathematical algorithms using nine risk factors: age, smoking history, diabetes, history of periodontal surgery, pocket depth, furcation involvements, restorations or calculus below the gingival margin, radiographic bone height, vertical bone lesions <b>Disease Score Categorised as 1-100</b>	Mean Tooth Loss/patient 1.26 ±2.53  Entire study population's mean tooth loss rate (MTLR) = 0.11±0.26	<b>Low</b>	<b>Risk assessed by PRC and Disease Severity Score significantly predicted outcomes in terms of tooth loss.</b>
<i>Matuliene et al. 2010</i> (Switzerland) Retrospective Cohort Study	N =160 Periodontitis patients treated and in supportive periodontal care Low risk n=11 Moderate risk n=90 High risk n=59 Mean age=46.7 yrs	Follow-up=approx. 10 years	<b>PRA</b> Periodontal risk hexagon diagram proposed by Lang & Tonetti (2003) Included parameters were: Percentage BOP, number of residuals pockets with probing depths ≥5mm, number of teeth lost, bone loss/age ratio, systemic or genetic factors (diabetes or IL-1 gene polymorphism), environmental factors (smoking status).	% of patients experiencing periodontitis recurrence with: Low-risk profile – 18.2% Moderate-risk profile – 42.2% High-risk profile – 49.2%  Tooth loss by risk profile: Low-risk profile – 1.18±1.9 Moderate-risk profile – 1.02±1.8 High-risk profile - 2.59±3.9	<b>Low</b>	<b>Risk assessed by PRA significantly predicted outcomes in terms of periodontitis progression and tooth loss.</b>

Age range 15-71  
yrs Males=45%

<p><i>Meyer-Bäumer et al. 2012</i> (Germany) Retrospective Cohort Study</p>	<p>N = 86 Aggressive Periodontitis (AgP) treated and in supportive periodontal therapy (SPT) Moderate-risk profile n=26 High risk profile n=70 Age≤36 years at baseline Males=18.6%</p>	<p><b>More than 5 years</b></p>	<p><b>PRA</b> Periodontal risk hexagon diagram proposed by Lang &amp; Tonetti (2003). Included parameters were: Percentage BOP, number of residuals pockets with probing depths ≥5mm, number of teeth lost, bone loss/age ratio, systemic or genetic factors (diabetes or IL-1 gene polymorphism), environmental factors (smoking status).</p>	<p>-During SPT 98 teeth/2202 teeth were lost (mean tooth loss of 1.14 per patient (SD 1.78) over mean of 9.7 SPT years. -53.5% of patients had no tooth loss -High risk profile resulted in 1.23 teeth loss/patient (SD 1.86) -Most teeth lost in non-compliant patients with high-risk profile (mean loss of 1.36 teeth per patient) -Differences were significant for tooth loss when IL-1 gene polymorphism was removed as factor.</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p><b>Risk assessed by PRA significantly predicted outcomes in terms of tooth loss.</b></p>
<p><i>Costa et al. 2012</i> (Brazil) Prospective Cohort Study</p>	<p>N = 164 Periodontitis patients treated and in supportive periodontal therapy Regular compliers=75 Erratic compliers=89 Age range 18-62 years Males=37% Smokers=29% Diabetes=8%</p>	<p>3 year follow-up assessment</p>	<p><b>PRA</b> Applied the periodontal risk assessment diagram proposed by Lang &amp; Tonetti (2003)  Included parameters were: Percentage BOP, number of residuals pockets with probing depths ≥5mm, number of teeth lost, bone loss/age ratio, systemic or genetic factors (diabetes or IL-1 gene polymorphism), environmental factors (smoking status).</p>	<p>Rate of periodontitis recurrence for regular compliers and erratic compliers: - moderate risk group 2.7% and 3.4% respectively - high risk group 6.7% and 11.2% respectively Tooth loss in regular and erratic compliers: - Risk for tooth loss (OR 95% CI) by PRA parameter: BOP 2.23 (1.02, 5.68) p=0.021 Sites with PD≥5mm 1.81(0.96, 1.94) p = 0.361 Number of missing teeth 2.21 (1.13,5.31) p=0.022 Bone loss/age ratio 2.73 (1.04, 4.92) P&lt;0.001 Diabetes (yes vs. no) 1.92 (1.01, 7.28) p=0.026 Smoking (yes vs. no) 3.41 (1.26,11.41)</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p><b>Risk assessed by PRA significantly predicted outcomes in terms of periodontitis progression and tooth loss.</b></p>



p<0.001)

Lü et al. 2013  (China)  Retrospective Cohort Study	N = 88 Aggressive Periodontitis (AgP) treated and in supportive periodontal care Mean age = 27 years Males n=30 Smokers n=3 Systemic diseases=none	Approx. 3-7 years follow up	<b>PRA/MPRA</b> <b>PRA (as proposed by Lang &amp; Tonetti 2003)</b> Included parameters were: Percentage BOP, number of residuals pockets with probing depths ≥5mm, number of teeth lost, bone loss/age ratio, systemic or genetic factors (diabetes or IL-1 gene polymorphism), environmental factors (smoking status). <b>MPRA</b> is an alternate modification of the PRA that replaces BOP with bleeding index>2, counting sites with PPD ≥6mm, calculating full-mouth average BL over age	Based on original PRA, 87 patients (98.8%) had a high-risk profile. According to three MPRA models, annual TL per patient values were greater in high-risk groups than in low-to-moderate risk groups (MPRA-1, 0.20 – 0.33 versus 0.04 – 0.14; MPRA-2, 0.18 – 0.32 versus 0.05 – 0.14; MPRA-3, 0.17 – 0.32 versus 0.05 – 0.15; P <0.05). By MPRA-1, irregular compliers with low-to-moderate risk profile had greater ΔBL (0.027 – 0.031, indicating bone increment) than those with high risk (-0.012 – 0.064, tendency for BL). For regular compliers, no significant differences of annual TL or ΔBL were found between risk groups.	Medium	<b>Risk assessed by PRA significantly predicted outcomes in terms of periodontitis progression and tooth loss.</b>
---	---	-----------------------------	---	---	--------	--

Figure 1. Prisma Flow Diagram

